The Pure Infinite and the Process of Victory

By

Slavoj Zizek

Table of Contents

I. The Subject as Substance and the Split between the Subject and Substance as in Fact the Self-Split of the Proletariat from the Party and the Individual, how the Individual Leads as the People and Finds a Emancipation of Singular and Universal Joined in Parallax
II. Jameson as Allegorist
III. Simple Onticness and Worldliness
IV. Utopian Constellations in the process of the Subject – how the Subject is with the Universal – this Benjaminian tradition of the oppressed.

Part I – The Most Sublime Subject

I. Dialectical Sequiters

So when Sirohi recently writes on the singular subject of Christian Kierkegaardianism with the universal of the people joined to freedoms for basically the people and living Blanquism as also freedom added to the people's lived experience. It means that the process of victory is clearly for Sirohi with in fact Nunes, and Syriza for the absolute experience of New Left victories. But in fact the old word of Communism is still alive in India where he is nearly victorious as President. But in fact he opts neither for Communist state power nor hegemony he means, but a direct Singular Universal with the people. Something like a shift he suggests from the Luckacsian engagement with the proletariat and its self-co-incidence with the event of the Lenin party and Leninist party, but towards in fact the liberation of the people by an Individual – Aristide, who is an inspirational Sirohi himself in fact.

II. Absolute

And so the absolute is simply the process of Sartre and his Being and Nothingness plunged into the Critique of Dialectical Reason which then is a shift from totalization to the process of liberation from totalization and totality and such developments as Cuba, Algeria and even why not Badiou's admiration for China and Mao, towards the Blanquist Bifurcation as Peter Hallward argues between the Individual and Universal of the people. This twist then is the movement of the in-itself to the for-itself as the Substance as Subject. Now Parsifal as Marx argues.

III. Lacan and Sirohi, when Kierkegaard becomes a Political Leader and Victory

And so when Lacan argues in Seminar X, that in fact the militant is then the subject, Sirohi adds as victorious. He means the passage from substance to Subject is then the self-split of the Lacanian split subject to itself as subject in victory. He means do not pass the impasse as Badiou argues about the Theory of the Subject, but in fact Pass the Subject as Sirohi means. Be more subjective and engaged.

Part II – Victory and Subject Again, A Musical Variant

And so in fact engagement according to Saroj Giri in India has been criticized in history, again and again, the postmodern fashions of then to follow in fact he argues “the simple option and lure of liberal democracy that we should not engage, as Sirohi wins in India, the opposite choice, to participate in liberal democracy of course but as a Communist.” It means then that the process of liberal capitalo-parliamentarism is then also the process of Luckacs in India. CPIM, CPI and CPIML has won in the recent elections a high stake in the parliament. Then that the individual has now participated in a party and is engaged, but then of course a crisis in life is nothingess, which means not a problem – just the will, the willingness to music frees a person. It means then that the person is a subject. He is not part of the process of history in the sense of following in abstract formalism the process of the universalizing of freedom as then the proletariat which is then current working class strikes and also political freedoms and finally also Spanish peasant protests and even Syriza’s Oxi which then is the universality of the people which is actually and in fact the moment of the individual and engagement – that subject that political citizen in the actual sense of a person who acknowledges his being as simple, he means this is simple for me – engagement is in Sartre to engage on literature. The process of literature and engagement becomes the process of the Subject to Will the power of what Foucault calls a battle even in individual health crises, it is a battle for the Subject to win, when he is a creative subject.

I. Political Science – the Art of Politics

The social structure in Algeria and Cuba and even China in the historical process is then mediated by working people and black people or Chinese working class and peasant classes which then is mediated by protests and even trade unions and peasant class action which becomes then in Althusser the beginning tactical position of the trade union and party activists which then is about the conclusion in phases of the movement of dialectical processes which makes the people win. The failure of protests then marks another phase which then in a singular detail is the crisis of Noyeaux’s in Algeria and even China which is then simply becoming a specialist which is permanent working classes which is from also it means a simple working process which it is reduced to. It means the process is counter-praxis of the division of the working class into a non-striking working class. It is the conclusion of Chinese Cultural Revolution by the process of calling off the Shanghai Commune.

This calling off then Saroj Giri recently remarks “When revolution then is a winning force of the people and always about the permanent revolution which means Marxist trade unionism, why call off a strike? In fact political crises are a symptom of the strike and the putting of politics in

command failing for something ineffable like a bourgeois compromise against the real movement. I mean the bourgeois character of these decisions in history is clear to a militant – just that then politics calls compromise."

In the art of politics, there is success only when the subject is engaged and the particular universalizes itself. The calling off of Shanghai Commune is described by the historian E.H. Carr as "dramatic, and eventful strikes being called off, what a surprise that Mao finds himself dogmatic in the heights of a highest freedom. This decision is so vague."

This then is the passage from in-itself to for-itself missed by Mao, and other revolutionaries before Sirohi, the Prophet. He is just the passage again and again, as in fact twisting and forcing of the in-itself as for-itself, from Substance to Subject again and even its parallax as the freedom of the working class as his freedom and his absolute example as Christ-Event. Before this process there was only the removal of the radical Commune process as Marx critiques the Paris Commune for trade union mass politics but not as Badiou who admires the Event without the radical dimension of commitment to the people in Sirohi and myself.

Part III – How Jameson feels about Life as a Success

I. Fredric Jameson

The world then has institutions and complex wurdenstill which means that in fact there is a historical trope called in fact tropes and history which means that music and cinema are produced by a company which unfolds its trope as in fact a complex movement of what was first a long symphony which becomes by now a simple rock song which then the movement of maximal processes with tropes in minimalism. Now in fact this trope is free of causality and is an analogy. The world is about tropes – like the process of finally Amazon these days which is run by myself – a simple Wurdenstill of commodities.

So Fredric Jameson writes -

"In this process of tropes which is also an analogy – just as the series, parallelism and causality leave way to a language of analogy this means the process of living people in Paris in the early 19th century then was just as to the process of in fact living people in cars and tropes of cars and magazines and living magazine culture which became cafes and literary cafes. Now this simple series is compared to manufacturing in the 20th century.

Jameson here means that life is a formal trope of series and parallelisms, which also means finally that the image here is a complex juxtaposition of images, the base and superstructure in the same asymmetric image. Now

it also means that images are finally also fine art images of people in a picnic and working on impressions of the city and cars and buildings.

This then means in fact that the singular universal is then an actual living person who is is in a coffee shop talking to his friend about life and this singular universal image is then actually the point of history. Not the complex mediations of base and superstructure and developments of politics and say political strike of classes and masses and even financial economics or even many mediations of say spatial dialectics and all its wonders of complex syllogisms of the universal and particulat with the singular – something like base and superstructure as first factories and then institutions and then in fact existential complexity and lived freedoms but in fact the singular universal alone as a short-level direct universal of the individual – something like a image of just a man in a coffee shop is history actually. Just existentialism."

This process of fine art and syllogisms of the process of existentialism then as the basically simple process of Sartre shifted to Sirohianism, then is too simple as Heideggereianism left in Jameson, his love for belonging and even being there as Dasein's worldy being-there.

No it should be instead a process of militant engagement to the Truth, the cause in line with the people as True path.

II. Process of the Subject

I. Universal and Particular

The working class then is the particular which universalizes as a protest which then is also in fact the process of the individual who leads them.

This then means the universal and the individual who is free from syllogistic mediations of the party and the people and its pitfalls in Communism – that party man and bureaucrat who has to work for the party and the state which is also a state revolutionary. It also means then in an Excursus in Peter Hallward how in fact the literary movement of Blanqui and his Bifurcation that finally the movement of politics is also the movement of riots, and protests and the will of the people. But Blanqui bifurcates this will with the individual who then in fact is Blanquist and so in fact free of the will. He means the free leader is one who is jazz and dialectical and free of the people. This thesis means the singular detail of a leader is one who is on the road and driving a car and meeting the people and making it to the working class factories and is in

fact also among the people or if vertical he is a leader who is indifferent to the people.

In a unique constellation with the individual living people, Blanqui is bourgeois and about drinking and bourgeois freedoms for himself which extremely supports the will. He means the bifurcation is about the will and the people against the individual. This way in fact the syllogism of the universal people and proletariat and the leader is broken, bifurcated maximally, the people are free of the coercion of a party.

II. Slavoj Zizek's Critique of the Politics of the Will

I mean therefore Zizek argues we have only the individual free of the Luckacsian engagement of the universal co-inciding with the people and the proletariat in a twist of the in-itself to the for-itself and event which the individual then leads with the party in self-splitting the same into the self-co-incidence of the part with itself as Event.

This syllogism of event then means in fact that Peter Hallward and Saroj Giri, even Dhruv Jain and Alberto Toscano are wrong to support the singularity of the process as Communist and Communism which is singular.

They are too singularly involved in the process of the individual as some cool, brilliant man who is free of the hard work of Paulinian love and grace and work with the poor which then is one side of the politics not its entire will. This then means to them, how the leader should be finally a person among the poor but also a person apart from the poor, something qualitative happens when quantities are broken away from and produce a symphony or jazz of a politician. Someone who spends life working on Cornel West and frees up from institutions and politics and even high politics and elite parliaments and is in fact a singular-univeral Kierkegaardian moment in becoming to the process of politics and abstracted from it.

No the militant Zizek argues is old fashioned and with the thesis of the Event, and maximally with the process of the Universal.